

STATE OF MICHIGAN

IN the Supreme Court

People of the State of Michigan

SC NO: 157581

Plaintiff-Appellee

COA NO: 336598

VS


Clifford MCKEE, 186624,

Lower Court NO: 15-002787-FL

Defendant-Appellant

---

Clifford McKee #186624 Defendant-Appellant Prob/Prer  
Chippewa Correctional Facility 4264 W.M-80  
Kincheloe, MI. 49784 (906) 495-2275



Jerard M. Jarzynka (P35496) Jackson Co. Prosecutor  
Jefford Schatten Boral (33223) Chief Appellate Attorney  
312 S. Jackson Street Jackson, Michigan 49201-2200  
(517) 788-4383

---

Defendant-Appellant Clifford McKee's objections and response to the prosecutor's answer to application for leave to appeal (intapp 1-4) dated May 18, 2018, should be denied, due to structural error, plain error, fact-finding is clearly erroneous, and police and prosecutorial misconduct, inadmissible hearsay that "prejudiced this case and wants a remand for a Writ hearing, entrapment, hearing, a new trial, where the court of appeal's made a "palpable error which this court has been misled too".

The defendant-appellant Clifford McKee, moves this Honorable Court to grant this objections, and response to the prosecutor's answer to application for leave to appeal and states as follows:

I. Defendant- Appellant Clifford McKee's  
objection to Appellee's answers on  
Page 1, and Page 2 as follows:

1. Defendant- Appellee Clifford McKee objects to Appellee's answers in paragraph 1 page 1-3, where the courts, and this court has been misled by the Trial Court, Trial Court Prosecutor of Jackson County, and defense trial counsel who engaged in "extrinsic fraud upon the court," where the record reflect that the police and prosecution engaged in misconduct, and entrapment, to an illegal search and seizure of defendant- Appellee Clifford McKee's person and cell phone without a warrant, where the illegal arrest was unconstitutional as well, see People v. Martin, 94 Mich. App. 644, 643 653 (1980); People v. Davenport, 99 Mich. App. 687, 692; 299 NW2d 308 (1980). The Trial Court erred in failing to suppress evidence of statements made by the defendant as a result of an illegal arrest, and where the court should have suppressed the hearsay by co-defendant Butler statements also, People v. Lewis, 160 Mich. App. 20, 27, 33 ("The Trial Court erred by failing to suppress evidence of statements made by the defendant as a result of illegal arrest, we find it necessary to reverse the defendant's convictions and remand the case back for a new trial"). See also People v. Hawkins, 468 Mich. 488, 495; 668 NW2d 602 (2003), and MCL § 780.653.  
Note 1: People v. Juller, 439 Mich. 34, 71-72; 475 NW2d 801 (1991); U.S. v. Russell, 411 US 423, 442-445 (1973).  
Note 2: People v. Peralo, 272 Mich. App. 294, 399-400 (2007) (requires a hearing); People v. D'Angelo, 401 Mich. 167, 172 176-177 (1977).  
Note 3: U.S. Const. Am. 1, W. V. XI, XIII; Riley v. California, 134 Sct 2473, 2443-2497 (2014); People v. Mahdi, 317 Mich. App. 446; at 456-464; 899 NW2d 732 at 740-743 (2017); People v. Hill, 284 Mich. App. 402, at 412 (2013).  
Note 4: People v. Hill, supra 402, 412; Davis v. U.S., 564 US 229, 336; 131 Sct 2419 (2011). See also MCL § 764.1 (2014).  
Note 5: People v. Bingham, 370 Mich. App. 656, at 661-663 (2014); People v. Dragman, 264 Mich. App. 338, 341; 711 NW2d 386 (2005).

## II. Defendant Appellant McKee's objections

to Appellee's answers on page 2 paragraphs 1,

2, 3, 4, 5, 6 & 11, due to Trial Court &

the Court of Appeals plain error, and evidentiary ruling:

2. Defendant Appellant McKee objections to Appellee's answer on page 2 paragraph 1 (4.) AND WHERE THE TRIAL COURT'S EVIDENTIARY RULINGS ARE AN ABUSE OF DISCRETION people v. Adair, 452 Mich. 473 (1996), and warrants a remand due to this abuse of discretion in sentencing transcripts ("Steps 4-7"). people v. Hall, 219 Mich. App. 244 (1996) (explaining an abuse of discretion on evidentiary issues) (same): people v. Price, 314 Mich. App. 538 (1995), and at sentencing people v. Lockridge, 498 Mich. 355; 870 N.W.2d 502 (2015) (Michigan sentencing scheme is constitutionally deficient, and amounts to sentencing entrapment), and requires a remand and "Crosby Hearing". The Court of Appeal order dated February 27, 2018 (pages 1-10 at 13-16) was inadmissible hearsay Crawford v. Washington, 541 U.S. 36-40 (2004), and thus violated Defendant Appellee McKee's due process. Chambers v. Mississippi, 410 U.S. 284-289 (1973), and this erroneous evidentiary ruling did rise to a due process violation, by the Trial Court. Sinkfield v. Biyano, 487 F.3d 1013 (6th Cir. 2007); Daly v. Burt, 613 F.Supp.2d 916 (E.D. Mich. 2009)
3. Defendant Appellant McKee objection to Appellee's page 2 paragraph 2 (5.), the Court of Appeals Affirmed. And denied re-hearing was a plain error, people v. Carino, 460

MICH. 760 at 763 (1999), and FACT-FINDING AT THE BENCH IS CLEARLY EVIDENT. people v. DALLIA, 398 MICH. 250 (1976); people v. MARTIN, 450 MICH. 250; 538 NW2d 399 (1995). See ALSO MICH. 2.613 (C).

4. DEFENDANT - APPELLANT - MCKEE'S OBJECTION TO APPELLEE'S ANSWER ON PAGE 2 PARAGRAPH 3 (b.), IS WHERE HE IS ON APPEAL FOR [T] HIS CASE AND DOES NOT HAVE ANY INFORMATION, BELIEF OR KNOWLEDGE OF WHAT OTHER CO-DEFENDANTS HAVE DONE OR DOING.

5. DEFENDANT - APPELLATE MCKEE'S OBJECTION TO APPELLEE'S ANSWER ON PAGE 2, PARAGRAPH 4 (a.) BECAUSE THE APPELLEE'S CONTINUE TO MISLEAD THIS COURT BY ASKING TO DENY THIS APPLICATION FOR LEAVE BEFORE THE COURT THAT WARRANT (1) A DEMAND FOR AN EVIDENTIARY HEARING AGAIN BECAUSE THE TRIAL COURT AND COURT OF APPEALS ERRED. people v. WILLIAMS, 374 MICH. 331 (1965).

(2) FOR AN ENTRAPMENT HEARING people v. PROSE, SUPRA 272 MICH. APP. 394, 399-400; people v. D'ANGELO, SUPRA 401 MICH. 167, 172, 176-177, AND (3) A DEMAND ALSO REQUIRES A NEW TRIAL BECAUSE

THE TRIAL COURT ALLOWED THIS "INADMISSIBLE HEARSAY" TO THE JURY THAT RENDERED THE TRIAL FUNDA-  
MENTALLY UNFAIR. Ege v. YOKINS, 485 F3d 364 (6th Cir. 2007). THE COURT OF APPEALS EVIDENTLY

ERRED IN [T] HIS CASE NOT GRANTING A MISTRIAL FOR DEFENDANT - APPELLATE MCKEE, people v. DENNIS  
464 MICH. 567, 572; 626 NW2d 505 (2001); people v. HAYWOOD, 209 MICH. APP. 217, 520  
NW2d 497 (1995), SEE ALSO people v. CUNNINGHAM, 315 MICH. APP. 652; 596 NW2d 715 (1999),

THAT WARRANTS A REVERSAL. DEFENDANT - APPELLATE MCKEE WAS EXTREMELY PREJUDICED BY  
THIS FAILURE TO NOT GRANT THE MISTRIAL. people v. DENNIS, SUPRA 567, 572; people v. CUNNINGHAM,

Supra 215 MICH. APP. 652-655. DEFENDANT-APPELLANT MCKEE WAS DENIED HIS GUARANTEED DUE PROCESS AND EQUAL PROTECTION RIGHTS TO A FAIR TRIAL BY THE TRIAL COURT. PEOPLE V. JACKSON, 247 MICH. APP. 583, 598; 808 NW2D 541, 553 (2011); PEOPLE V. COLLIER, 168 MICH. APP. 687, AT 697; 425 NW2D 68 (1988) CONVICTION REVERSED AND REMANDED.

6. THE DEFENDANT-APPELLATE CLIFFORD MCKEE CONTENDS THAT THE PROSECUTOR APPELLEE'S ANSWER IN PARAGRAPH 5 ON PAGE 2, AND PARAGRAPH WHERE THESE ERRORS, AND JURY INSTRUCTIONS ARE STRUCTURAL ERRORS THAT CAN NEVER BE DEEMED HARMLESS. ARIZONA V. FULMINANTE, 499 U.S. 279, 301; 111 S.Ct 1265 (1991); BARKEN V. YUKINS, 199 F3D 867, 875 (6TH CIR. 1994); PEOPLE V. DUNCAN, 462 MICH. 47, 52, 55; 610 NW2D 551, 556 (2000).

7. DEFENDANT-APPELLANT CLIFFORD MCKEE STATES THAT PARAGRAPH 6 ON PAGE 2 ANSWER BY THE APPELLEE IS WITHOUT MERIT, AS STATED ABOVE IN OBJECTIONS 1-6, AT 6, AND THE COURT OF APPEALS VALIDATED THESE "STRUCTURAL ERRORS AND DEFECTS" THAT REQUIRE AN AUTOMATIC REVERSAL ON 2127118 (OT APS 1-18) AT 13-16 THAT THE ADMISSION OF CO-DEFENDANT BUTLER STATEMENTS WAS INADMISSIBLE HEARSAY) CRAWFORD, SUPRA 541 U.S. 36-41. SEE ALSO PEOPLE V. BURTON, 485 MICH. 268, 283, 285 (1989); PEOPLE V. KREIMEN, 415 MICH. 372, 377 (1992), AND CONSTITUTES AS A STRUCTURAL ERROR, PEOPLE V. DUNCAN, SUPRA 47, 52, 55; ARIZONA, SUPRA 279, 301-303; NEEDLEMAN V. U.S., 537 U.S. 1, 4-8; 119 S.Ct 1827 (1999). THE APPELLEE'S ANSWER ON PAGE 2 LINE 1 IS FLAT OUT UNTRUE, AND MATERIALLY FALSE. SEE EXHIBITS (A), AND EXHIBIT (B) MAOL EXPEDITED LEGAL MAIL FORMS THAT THESE DOCUMENTS WERE SENT TO THEM ON MULTIPLE OCCASIONS DATED 11/16/2017, AND APRIL 10, 2018, AND IN COA RECONSIDERATION.

III. Defendant-Appellant Clifford McKee's objections to Appellee's answers on page 3, paragraphs 1, 2, 3 Linn 2, 3 is misleading, clearly erroneous, and lacks legal merit after the 2/27/18 orders on 13-16, 17-18

8. In People v. Pipo 475 Mich. 267 at 284; 715 N.W.2d 290 (2006), this Court outcome "THE JUDGMENT REVERSING DEFENDANT'S CONVICTIONS WAS REVERSED" because this defendant failed to object or move for a MISTRIAL on Bruton grounds, or on appeal, so the court stated the defendant failed to show he was prejudiced requiring reversal, actual innocence, or that the error seriously affected the fairness, integrity, or public reputation of the trial. Honorable CAVANAGH, J. (dissenting), stated in relevant part: "I believe that this case represents a textbook example of when separate trials or separate jury juries should be used. I agree with the majority that Burton v. United States, 391 U.S. 123; 88 S.Ct 1620; 20 L.Ed.2d 476 (1968), was violated in this case. Defendant's Sixth Amendment Confrontation Clause rights were violated when the statements of each defendant's non-testifying co-defendants were heard by the single jury at defendant's joint trial."

9. Unlike People v. Pipo, supra this defendant-Appellant Clifford McKee did preserve these errors, where the Court of Appeals clearly stated that co-defendant Butlers statements were obtained in violation of the Fifth Amendment. Milanda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 436; 86 S.Ct 1602 (1966). See also February 27, 2018 ("OT pgs 13-16 at page 16"), where Defendant-Appellant Clifford Durrell McKee warrants a new trial because he has been "prejudice by inadmissible hearsay." People v. Lewis, supra 160 Mich. App. 20, 27, 33; People v. BMC Burton, supra 433 Mich. 268, 269, 265.

So, Appellee's answers in paragraphs 1, and 2 on 23LACUS merit, see also page 1-3, and Brief Summary of Facts paragraph 1 of pages 1-6 to Michigan Supreme Court Application for Leave.

10. In People v. Watkins, 438 Mich. 627 at 647-652; 475 NW2d. 727 (1991), a jury convicted defendants of murder based in part on the alleged confession of their co-defendant. The Court of Appeals (Michigan) affirmed the convictions, and the defendants appealed. The Michigan Supreme Court reversed the convictions and remanded for retrial without admissions of the co-defendant confessions. Defendant-appellant Clifford Durrell McKee's conviction warrants a remand and to vacate the Court of Appeals error. To see People v. Kowalski, 492 Mich. 106 at 140 - 144; 821 NW2d 14, 18 (2012), this Court reversed the judgment in so far as it excluded one expert's testimony regarding the psychological testing he performed on the defendant, and the case was remanded to the circuit court to determine its admissibility under MRE 702 and MRE 403. In People v. Barrera, 451 Mich. 201, 266-269, 270-272; 547 NW2d. 280 (1996), this Court stated that the trial court erred, violated the defendant's due process under U.S. Const. Am XIV§1, abused its discretion in excluding the co-defendant's statement, and reversed the trial court's judgment and defendant's convictions and remanded for new trials. "[N]o reasonable jury would have convicted defendant-appellant Clifford Durrell McKee, now that the Michigan Court of Appeals has ruled that the statements made by co-defendant Butler

in the order dated February 27, 2010 (Opps 13-16 at page 16<sup>3</sup>), and constitutes AS A INSTRUCTUAL ERROR, THAT WARRANTS A NEW TRIAL. See for example People v. Yang 472 Mich. 130, 141-142 (2005) (THE McByrde), A NEW TRIAL WAS ORDERED DUE TO INSTRUCTUAL ERROR. People v. Howe, 372 Mich. 670 (1970) reversed on error; People v. Silden, 466 Mich. 386, 397 (2002) (same); People v. Tanner, 255 Mich. App. 369, 372 477 (2003); Tanner v. Yukins, 807 F.3d 661, 695 (2017), BUT SEE ALSO REVOKED OR INSTRUCTUAL ERROR. People v. Carter, 467 Mich. 206, 220 (2000); People v. Rodriguez 463 Mich. 466, 474 (2000).

11. Defendant-Appellant Clifford McKee's objections to Appellee's answers in paragraph 3, on page 3 AS A FAILURE TO RAISE ENTRAPMENT BEFORE SENTENCING WAIVES IT, IS MISPLACED BY CITING People v. Craig, 444 Mich. 463, 464 (1993). See People v. Pierre, supra 272 Mich. App. 394, 399-400, THE COURT STATED IN RELEVANT PART: "THERE IS NO SPECIFIC TIME FOR RAISING AN ENTRAPMENT OBJECTION AND CAN BE RAISED AT ANY TIME, AND WHERE "AFFIRMATIVE GOVERNMENTAL MISCONDUCT" IS ASSERTED AN ENTRAPMENT HEARING AND DEMAND IS REQUIRED" I.D. AT 399-400. SEE ALSO People v. Lockridge supra 498 Mich. 358; 870 N.W.2d. 502-508 (2015) (SENTENCING ENTRAPMENT CAN OCCURE AND DID IN THIS CASE). AS TO FAILING TO RAISE ILLEGAL SEARCH AND SEIZURE PRIOR TO SENTENCING THIS WAS ARGUED PRIOR TO TRIAL AT THE WALKER HEARING, IN EXHIBITS PRESENTED BY APPELLATE COUNSEL IN THE COURT OF APPEALS, PRO PRO BRIEFS AND MOTIONS, AND RECONSIDERATION MOTIONS SENT TO THE APPELLEE'S NAW ON (4) FOUR TIMES. APPELLEE ANSWER IN PARAGRAPH 3 OF PAGE 3, AND PARAGRAPH 1 OF PAGE 5 IS MISPLACED —

12. In Bergen v. United States, 295 U.S. 78, 88 S.Ct 630 (1935), the United States THAT A PROSECUTOR CAN NOT USE A CALCULATED METHOD TO AWFULLY OBTAIN A CONVICTION, OR TO STRIKE HARD AND FOUL BLOWS. SEE ALSO people v. Moore, 189 Mich. App. 315 at 323; 472 NW2d 105 (1991). In people v. Spagnola, 2018 Mich. App. Lexis 434 THIS COURT VACATED THE DEFENDANT'S CONVICTION AND GRANTED A NEW TRIAL CITING Bergen v. United States, 295 U.S. 78, 88 S.Ct 629, 79 LEd 2d 1314 (1935). In people v. Borkley, 424 Mich. 1, at 33; 378 NW2d 432 at 447 (1985), THE COURT REVERSED THE JUDGMENT OF THE COURT OF APPEALS IN BOTH CASES, REMANDED BOTH CASES TO THE COURT OF APPEALS FOR CONSIDERATION OF NEW TRIAL ISSUES RAISED IN DEFENDANTS CROSS APPEALS, AND REMANDED ONE CASE FOR CONSIDERATION OF WHETHER THE PROSECUTOR'S QUESTIONING OF DEFENDANT AS TO HIS FINANCIAL CONDITION WAS REVERSAL ERROR IN FRONT OF THE JURY. THE DEFENDANT-APPELLANT CLIFFORD MCKEE "ONLY ALLEGED EVIDENCE AGAINST HIM PRESENTED IN FRONT OF THE JURY, THE MICHIGAN COURT OF APPEALS STATED WAS INADMISSIBLE IN ITS ORDER DATED FEBRUARY 27, 2018 ("6/13-16") AT PAGE 16 IS INADMISSIBLE HEARING THAT WARRANTS A NEW TRIAL. people v. Lewis, 160 Mich. App. 20, 27, 33; people v. Burton, 433 Mich. 268, at 283, 285 (1989); people v. Kremer, 415 Mich. 374, 377 (1982). In people v. Blackman, 280 Mich. App. 253, 268; 761 NW2d 172 (2008) QUOTING Bergen v. U.S., supra 295 U.S. 78, 88 S.Ct 629, 79 LEd 2d 1314 (1935), THE ERROR WAS HARMLESS BUT IN THIS CASE THEY WERE NOT HARMLESS AND VICTIMIZED DEFENDANT-APPELLANT MCKEE OVER PROSEC AND UNDERMINED THE BEST RELIABILITY OF THE VERDICT AND IS A STRUCTURAL ERROR.

People v. Duncan, supra 47, 52, 55: THE COURT OF APPEALS MADE A "PALPABLE ERROR" ALIA 7.215 (2) (1) (2).

#### IV. STANDARD OF REVIEW

13. AN ABUSE OF DISCRETION OCCURS WHEN A TRIAL COURT'S DECISION "FALLS OUTSIDE THE RANGE OF REASONABLE AND PRINCIPLED OUTCOMES." People v. Duncan, 494 MICH. 713, 723; 835 NW2D 399 (2013). "A TRIAL COURT NECESSARILY ABUSES ITS DISCRETION WHEN IT MAKES AN ERROR IN LAW. Pirgore v. United Serv. Auto. Ass'n, 494 MICH. 269, 274; 884 NW2D 257 (2016). THE FACTS SUPPORTING THE GRANT OR DENIAL OF AN EVIDENTIARY HEARING ARE REVIEWED FOR CLEAR ERROR, AND THE APPLICATION OF THE LAW TO THOSE FACTS IS REVIEWED DE NOVO. People v. Martin 271 MICH. APP. 280, 304; 721 NW2D 817 (2006), AFF'D. 482 MICH. 851; 752 NW2D 457 (2008). A TRIAL COURT'S FACTUAL FINDING "IS CLEARLY ERRONEOUS IF THE REVIEWING COURT IS LEFT WITH A DEFINITE AND FIRM CONVICTION THAT THE TRIAL COURT MADE A MISTAKE". People v. Bylsma, 493 MICH. 17, 26; 825 NW2D 543 (2012). SEE ALSO People v. Franklin, 500 MICH. 92 AT 106; 844 NW2D 561 AT 566 (2017) (INVOLVED A FRANKS, HEARING, WARRANT, ILLEGAL SEARCH AND SEIZURE INTER ALIA CF U.S. CONST. AM IV: CONST. 1963, ART 1 § 11). IN THIS CASE THE RECORD REFLECTS THE TRIAL COURT JURY INSTRUCTIONS, AND ADMISSIBILITY OF CO-DEFENDANT BUTLER STATEMENTS IS A REVERSAL ERROR. People v. Sims, 449 MICH. 83, 110; 534 NW2D 675 AT 686 (1995); People v. Watkins, 178 MICH. APP. 439, 450; REAFF'D ON OTHER GROUNDS 438 MICH 627 (1991).

14. THE DEFENDANT-APPELLANT CLIFFORD MCKEE MOVES THIS COURT TO GRANT RELIEF PURSUANT TO MCR 7.316 MISCELLANEOUS RELIEF

(A) RELIEF OBTAINABLE. THE SUPREME COURT MAY AT ANY TIME, IN ADDITION TO ITS GENERAL POWERS

- (1) EXERCISE ANY OR ALL OF THE POWERS OF AMENDMENT OF THE COURT OR TRIBUNAL BELOW;
- (2) ON REASONABLE NOTICE AS IT MAY REQUIRE, ALLOW SUBSTITUTION OF PARTIES BY REASON OF MARRIAGE, DEATH, BANKRUPTCY, ASSIGNMENT, OR ANY OTHER CAUSE; ALLOW NEW PARTIES TO BE ADDED OR PARTIES TO BE DROPPED; OR ALLOW PARTIES TO BE REARRANGED AS APPELLANTS OR APPELLEES;
- (3) PERMIT THE REASONS OR GROUNDS OF APPEAL TO BE AMENDED OR NEW GROUNDS TO BE ADDED;
- (4) PERMIT THE TRANSCRIPT OR RECORD TO BE AMENDED BY CORRECTING ERRORS OR ADDING MATTERS THAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN INCLUDED;
- (5) ADJOURN THE CASE UNTIL FURTHER EVIDENCE IS TAKEN AND BROUGHT BEFORE IT;
- (6) DRAW INFERENCE OF FACT;
- (7) ENTER ANY JUDGMENT OR ORDER THAT OUGHT TO HAVE BEEN ENTERED, AND ENTER OTHER AND FURTHER ORDERS AND GRANT RELIEF AS THE CASE MAY REQUIRE; OR
- (8) IF A JUDGMENT NOTWITHSTANDING THE VERDICT IS SET ASIDE ON APPEAL, GRANT A NEW TRIAL OR OTHER RELIEF. SEE ALSO PEOPLE V. ECHOLS, 495 MICH. 952 (2014); PEOPLE V. BULLOCK, 440 MICH. 15 (1997); PEOPLE V. BOWENSCLOFF, 438 MICH. 55 AT 77 (1991), SEE ALSO PEOPLE V. BOURGEOIS, 439 MICH. 826 (1991), AND PEOPLE V. HEAMIZ, 467 MICH. 71, 78; 611 NW2D 783 (2000), THIS COURT CAN GRANT THE ABOVE RELIEF REQUESTED, AND A NEW TRIAL, AND -

Grant this pro per/prose application for leave to appeal and appoint counsel as justice  
so requires, and deny the appellee's request that leave be denied; and over (14) fourteen  
reasons legally as stated above, and to review all pro se/pro se pleadings, exhibits, libelal  
holding them to a less stringent standard than those drafted by trained lawyers, see  
People v. Moore, 498 Mich. 433: 825 NW2d. 580-581 (2013) citing Haines v. Kerner,  
404 U.S. 519, 520-521: 92 S.Ct. 594 (1972), leave to appeal requested with these objections.

May 29, 2018

Respectfully Submitted

Cliff D McKee

Clifford Owen McKee Pro Per/Prose # 186624  
In Pro Per Person Defendant - Appellant  
Chippewa Correctional Facility 4269 - W. MI-80  
Kincheloe, MI 49784 (906) 495. 7275

Pursuant to: 28 U.S.C. § 1746.

CC: Jackson Co. Prisoner.  
Jerrard M. Jazynik (P35496)

Note: the court rules MCR. 7.205  
MCR 7.215, MCR 7.216, MCR 7.302  
MCR 7.304, MCR 7.313, MCR 7.316  
only require that a party send copy  
and proof of service. I did that...  
the copy does not have to be a "perfect copy"  
Also sent over (3) three times now!! the  
Appellee's answers on page 2 n1 is flawed!!!

MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS  
DISBURSEMENT AUTHORIZATION (EXPEDITED LEGAL MAIL - PRISONER)

4835-3318  
CSJ-318 05/02

Please PRINT clearly illegible and/or incomplete forms will not be processed.

Lock: D-178 Institution: URF

Prisoner Number: 186024 Prisoner Name (Print Clearly): Clifford D. McKee

Legal Postage  Filing Fee \$ \_\_\_\_\_  Certified Mail (Must Be a Court Ordered Requirement)

New Case  Case Number: 336398 *1 million 1000000*

Pay To: URF MAIL ROOM

Mailing Address: Jerrod M. TAL ZINKO (P 35495) JACKSON Co. PROSECUTOR  
312 S. JACKSON STREET  
JACKSON, MI 48201

The following section must be completed in Authorizing Staff Member's presence

Prisoner Signature: Clifford D. McKee Date & Time Submitted: 3/15/18 9:00AM  
Received By: [Signature] Staff Signature: [Signature]  
Date & Time Received by Authorizing Staff: 3-15-18 0905

Authorization Denied:

- Does not meet definition of legal mail or court filing fee as identified in CFA OP 05.03.118.
- Not hand delivered to authorizing staff member.  New case or case number not on form.
- Does not include court order for handling as certified mail.  Other \_\_\_\_\_
- Prisoner refused to sign & date in staff member's presence.

Section below to be completed by Mail Room Staff

Placed in Mail by: [Signature] Signature: [Signature]  
Postage Amount: \$ 2.05 Date & Time placed in outgoing Mail: 3-16-18 5:00

Only Business Office Staff are to Write in the Section Below

Obligation Amount	Actual Expense

Court filing Fee Denied due to NSF.

RECEIVED  
Date Posted: 6-2018  
Date & Time Copy Sent to Prisoner: \_\_\_\_\_  
Signature: \_\_\_\_\_  
NITROSS HUB

Processed By: \_\_\_\_\_  
(Print Name & Title): \_\_\_\_\_

MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

CSJ-318

DISBURSEMENT AUTHORIZATION (EXPEDITED LEGAL MAIL - PRISONER)

REV. 11/15 4835-3318

Please PRINT clearly, illegible and/or incomplete forms will not be processed.

Lock 0-178 Institution ORF

Prisoner Number 186624

Prisoner Name Clifford D. McKee  
Type or Print Clearly

Legal Postage  Filing Fee \$  Certified Mail (Must Be a Court Ordered Requirement)

New Case  Case Number 336598

Pay To ORF MAIL ROOM

Mailing Address JEROLD U. JANZYNIKA (P 35496) JACKSON CO. PROSECUTOR  
312 S. JACKSON STREET  
JACKSON, Michigan 49701

Application Fee waived  
to appeal, Exhib. A,  
B, C, D, Brief, Remand  
motion affidavit, Petition  
of Seneca

The Following Section Must Be Completed in Authorizing Staff Member's Presence

Prisoner Signature Cliff D. McKee Date & Time Submitted 4/17/18 1939

Received by Walter R Staff Signature [Signature]  
Type or Print Name & Title

Date & Time Received by Authorizing Staff 4-17-18 10940

Authorization Denied

- Does not meet definition of legal mail or court filing fee as identified in OP 05.03.118
- Not hand-delivered to authorizing staff member
- Does not include court order for handling as certified mail
- Prisoner refused to sign & date in staff member's presence
- New case or case number not on form
- Other (explain)

Denied by

Type or Print Name & Title Signature

Section Below to be Completed by Mail Room Staff

Placed in Mail by R Valle Signature R Valle  
Type or Print Name & Title

Postage Amount \$7.23 Date Placed in Outgoing Mail 4-17-18 1pm

116 N. Maple St

Business Office Staff are to Write in

Postage \$ Total Obligation \$

Filing Fee \$ Check #

Date Copy Sent to Prisoner

Processed by

Type or Print Name & Title Signature

USPS TRACKING # & CUSTOMER RECEIPT LABEL (ROLL)  
9114 9014 9645 0798 7855 23  
For Tracking or Inquiries go to USPS.com or call 1-800-222-1011  
RECEIVED  
APR 18 2018  
1 - Kirtross HUB  
Fee Denied Due to NSF

STATE OF MICHIGAN

IN the SUPREME COURT

People of the STATE OF MICHIGAN,

PLAINTIFF - Appellee

MSC NO:


COA NO: 336548

LC. NO: 18-002787-FC

VS

Clifford McKee

DEFENDANT - APPELLANT



STATE OF MICHIGAN }  
COUNTY OF CHIPPewa }

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, Clifford Dorell McKee # 186624 Defendant-Appellant, certify that I mailed these objections pleadings against the Appellee, and Supreme Court Clerk, through MOOC expedited legal mail process address to the below listed parties CF MCL 7.302, MCL 7.304, MCL 7.305, MCL 7.306, MCL 7.311, MCL 7.313, MCL 7.316

• Michigan Supreme Court Clerk Hall of Justice P.O. Box 30052  
Lansing, Michigan 48909

• JERARD M. JARZYNSKA (P 35496) Jackson County Probation 312 S. JACKSON ST.  
JEROLD SCHROTER BOEN (P 37223) Chief Appellate Attorney JACKSON, MI 49201  
Clifford McKee (517) 788-4283

• Clifford Dorell McKee # 186624 Defendant-Appellate Clerk / PO for Chippewa Correctional Facility 4764 W. M-80 Kincadee, MI 49784 (906) 495-7275

MAY 31, 2018.

PURSUANT TO: INCA 7.316 (A) (7) "MISCELLANEOUS RELIEF"

(A) STATES "RELIEF OBTAINABLE, WHILE IS PENDING IN THE COURT SUPREME COURT, THE COURT, AT ANY TIME, IN ADDITION TO ITS GENERAL POWERS

(1)

[Faint, mostly illegible text and markings, possibly bleed-through from the reverse side of the page]